DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 999 SP 010 092

AUTHOR Mohr, Paul, Ed.
TITLE Desegregation, Culturalism and Humanism.
INSTITUTION Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, Lincoln, Nebr.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; *Cross Cultural Training; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Education; Cultural Pluralism; *Curriculum Development; Humanism; Humanistic Education; *Integration Effects; *Personnel Policy; *School Integration; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Multicultural Education

ABSTRACT

The multicultural education statement of the Multicultural Education Commission of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), "No One Model American," provides an impetus for much of the discussion in this selection of essays. The Brown I and Brown II court decisions escalated concerns as to how one person interacts with another in an institutional setting such as the school. Emerging from these landmark decisions were policies that had impact on the curricula, the faculty, the staff, and the students of the public school system. Recognizing that 21 years of trial and error in implementing school desegregation has produced limited results, two public school superintendents attempt to dramatize in essay form the need for a continuous concern relative to curricular and personnel policies that facilitate school desegregation. The emergence of plural diversity enlarged the concerns of educators and brought into focus such assumptions as presented in the essay here on "Multi-Ethnic Understanding." Comments on the AACTE's multicultural education statement are expressed in "Is the Glass Half-Empty or Half-Filled?" Finally, the totality of freeing individuals to realize their potential is broached in "Humanism and the Classroom Teacher." (MM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125999

DESEGREGATION, CULTURALISM AND HUMANISM

Edited By:

Paul Mohr

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

With Essays By:

Paul Mohr
Joseph Pete
H.B. Pinkney
Florence Roome

Published By:

The Curriculum Development Center
University of Nebraska
(Paul A. Olson, Director)

Lincoln, Nebraska
1976

SP010 092

This book is a study document produced for the Chicago-Southern Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers. It does not represent an official position of the Study Commission.

Published by

Nebraska Curriculum Development Center
University of Nebraska
Lincoln

1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgments vi

Introduction
Paul Mohr viii

School Desegregation and its Impact
Upon Curricular Policies and Practices
Joseph L. Pete 1

School Desegregation and its Impact
Upon Pupil Personnel Policies and
Practices, and Teacher Personnel
Policies and Practices
H.B. Pinkney 13

Some Basic Understandings: Toward
Multi-Ethnic Education
Florence L. Roane 23

No One Model American
A Statement on Multicultural Education 35

"Is The Glass Half-Empty or Half-Filled?"
Paul Mohr 41

Humanism and the Classroom Teacher
Paul Mohr 49

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is extended to the Teacher Education Liaison Committee of the Southern Regional Education Board for the use of specially prepared essays contained in this monograph. Recognition is also accorded the Multicultural Education Commission of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education. The use of its multicultural education Statement, "No One Model American," also provided an impetus for much of the dialogue on this issue.

Finally, we wish to thank Paul Olson and his staff for assisting us in perpetuating the discussion of "live" issues in teacher education.

INTRODUCTION

Paul Mohr
Dean, College of Education
Florida A & M University

INTRODUCTION

There is no question that a variety of position papers, books, articles, films, and slide-tape presentations relates to the title of this book, *Desegregation, Culturalism and Humanism.* Further, we can all assume that the topics are not discreet concepts, rather, they are a part of a continuum of human relationships that has yet to find itself institutionalized in schools, colleges, universities and society as a whole.

The Brown I and Brown II court decisions provided the impetus for the escalation of concerns as to how one person interacts with another in a strange institutional setting such as the school. These decisions struck down the "separate but equal" idea that permitted schools for whites and schools for blacks. Emerging from these landmark decisions were policies that impacted the curricula, the faculty, the staff and students of the public school system. Recognizing that 21 years of trials and errors in implementing school desegregation have produced limited results, two public school superintendents, Dr. Joseph Pete and Dr. H.B. Pinkney, attempt to dramatize the need for a continuous concern relative to curricular and personnel policies that facilitate school desegregation.

Desegregation with its concomitant of biculturalism and bi-racialism proved to be insufficient for the variety of ethnic, racial and cultural groups who at one time attempted to become assimilated into the American melting pot. Thus, the emergence of plural diversity and the resultant benefits enlarged the concerns of educators, thus, focusing upon such assumptions as presented by Dr. Florence Roane in her chapter on "Multi-ethnic Understanding."

The American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education has provided leadership for multicultural education on a national basis and its statement, "No One Model American" (NOMA), is presented. The concern of institutionalizing has been expressed in "Is The Glass Half-Empty or Half Filled?"

Finally, the totality of "freeing" individuals to realize their potential is broached in "Humanism and the Classroom Teacher."

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND ITS IMPACT UPON CURRICULAR POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Joseph L. Pete
Assistant Superintendent
Jackson, Mississippi

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND ITS IMPACT UPON CURRICULAR POLICIES AND PRACTICES

By
Joseph L. Pete

Introductory Remarks

Let me begin my introductory remarks by saying that the subject of teacher preparation is an area which is vital to our educational stability and one that is dear to my heart. I cannot stress the importance of how necessary it is that we have the most effective *teachers possible* in an instructional program for pupils. Having a high quality core of teacher personnel fuses a stronger link to successful pupil growth and achievement. We hear quite often in the syndrome of educational circles (which is mentioned with misgivings) that because of the educational shamble in which we find ourselves today, there is little hope of corralling forces and rising to the occasion of societal needs in the field of education. I maintain that it is absolutely necessary that we continue to emphasize stringent requirements at the entry level of teacher education. I have always been a firm believer in putting my best foot forward and I feel the same way about teacher preparation. If somehow we must have ineffective personnel in our field, let's screen the weak ones out first.

I find it rather timely and fitting that a discussion of this nature takes on the thrust of highlighting and discussing the topics that have been outlined. I particularly mention this for two specific reasons. *Number One:* Too long now has little, if any, attention been given to the concerns of multicultural education. *Number Two:* As reported by the *School Administrator's Bulletin* (Fall, 1973), a contract to design a national study of the impact of school desegregation has been awarded to the Rand Corporation by the U.S. Commission's Office on Civil Rights. It is worthy to point out that, with the exception of a very few local studies, the Coleman Report of 1966 is virtually the only piece of serious research that has been done in the area of school desegregation and presently it is being reviewed.

In getting to the task at hand, I find it ineffective and even less appealing to develop and establish a definitive rationale on, "what impact

school desegregation has had on curricular policies and practices?" I therefore find it appropriate that we move forward and address ourselves to the topics that have been specified and try to arrive at possible implications for a multicultural teacher education program. Most professionals, like myself, were either involved or in some way identified with the total desegregation process. In conjunction with that, it would be a mistake for me not to mention that whatever the impact—be it desegregation or otherwise—exerted efforts must be made to develop a unified construct in the area of curriculum, thereby seizing the opportunity for establishing a compatible educational program that is geared to the needs of students. Should we fail to provide this kind of educational structure, then may heaven forbid.

Consciousness

From all of the information researched and the contact made individually with respect to school desegregation, the number one item most often singled out as having the greatest impact on curricular policies and practices was the *consciousness* and *awareness* in the minds of certain ethnic groups that something immediately had to be done to improve the "quality of education" for *all* children who attend our schools across the country.

School desegregation has made everyone take a second hard look at himself and forced all ethnic groups to do something about what they saw. Now, what did we see? We saw traditionally college-oriented curriculum domination within programs. We have all heard the cliche "change the child or change the curriculum." Most educators would agree on the latter alternative, but this was not the case in the education of many minority groups (and particularly *blacks*). Immediately, ethnic minorities within our society began to recognize and rationalize; why the *sudden change*, and over concern for the welfare of *all* students? The reason also became very evident during this time why "quality education" had to be held as an item of "high priority." The implication and rationale were simple deductions. It was noted that we were about to experience a complete mixing of different ethnic groups. Ethnic majorities felt that one sure way to see that their little Sally, Dick and Jane were going to be taken care of was to emphasize the need to include all children in a support effort of *quality education.*

For the first time in the history of educational change, community involvement *without question* could be relied upon as related to the school

society. This concern was shared by educators, the business world and parents alike, especially the parents of children who were directly involved. There now existed an urgency to revamp and modify the school curriculum to match the needs of all ethnic groups and to insure that each pupil be treated with respect, recognition and understanding. This was not true in all cases. I am reminded of the fact that in 1975, we continue to have people who are still debating whether certain ethnic groups should be formally educated or not.

Large enrollment of minorities, where they in fact become the majority has had a great impact on the outcome of curriculum policies and practices. From the standpoint of community support and involvement the response on school bond issues and the increase of school mileage has generally been in it with complete "thumbs-down." The feeling of the general public and the attitudes on the part of influential entrepreneurs within many communities is that they are not in full support of education for minorities. In cases where the ratio is 75 percent majority and 25 percent minority, there is no problem; finance seems to be quite adequate. However, it becomes rather difficult to imagine that anything less than full support is provided in attempting to re-structure all phases of the school curriculum in our schools today; yet this can certainly be cited as a misdirection of our future course in tomorrow's education.

As a result of direct and observational impact attributed by school desegregation on curriculum, changes did in fact occur. During this period, many of the changes made were identified as both acceptable and nonacceptable. Brazziel, in his article on "Quality Education for Minorities," stated that during the desegregated period of school integration, the United States went through an experience described as a *nervous breakdown* with respect to our school situation. Immediately, we begin to feel the impact on practices within the schools.

Practices Impact

Out of this classic upheaval came the concept of behavioral objectives and the need for individualized instruction. These terms registered nothing new on the educational scene because good teachers had always prescribed and directed pupil instructions on the basis of individual needs. But somehow, it was communicated that a new direction had to be taken with the

oncoming of mixed staff and student population. There was this feeling of inadequate preparation on the part of minority groups and many questions were asked as to "how effectively they would perform in working with the majority ethnic group." This was not the only concern. There arose the problem of high and low achievers mixed together and what kind of standard was to be maintained with respect to student achievement. We are still working on that particular problem.

A study conducted within the Sacramento school system in 1971 purports that the impact of school desegregation in the area of curriculum is highly related to the improvement of readings and math achievement scores. In this study, 74 blacks and Chicano students were bussed to a predominately white school, while 198 others were maintained in an all segregated center. I can't say that I find this research at all refutable. But some of you may be of the opinion that if you had top-flight teachers and adequate materials, you could probably match similar gains as reported in the above results.

Other identified curricular practices began to surface during this stage. Team teaching certainly became popular and later we began to take on the idea of differentiated staffing. Another concept in our approach to teaching that became very popular was the idea of homogeneous grouping. This one gave us a lot of concerns because we ended up with desegregated classes in an integrated situation. Another practice which really turned out to be most disappointing, was the adding of a few black heroes to a study list in a literature course or by putting a few books on blacks in the library and taking claim for a black or ethnic studies program within the schools. Most assuredly, members of ethnic minorities have vigorously attacked this traditional educational policy which was designed primarily to perpetuate only one cultural heritage. The plea has been that this one-way heritage is inherently ethnocentric, unjust, and unrealistic in a culturally pluralistic setting. Curriculum materials which treat minorities very stereotypically must be abandoned. An authentic and diversified approach must be taken toward Black History and Ethnic Studies to facilitate the realities of multicultural education.

I do not mention these kinds of practices to be critical but merely to point out that changes did occur within our schools. We could continue to lengthen our list of additional happenings, but it would further serve no purpose. We now move to the impact of school desegregation upon school policy.

Policy Impact

At the outset, school policies reflected very little change as a result of school desegregation. For example, some schools still cannot understand why black children did not want to play "Dixie" in the school band--or salute a Confederate flag. Surprisingly, many schools still require these. Another area of concern was that of "pupil discipline." Student handbooks, with the approval of school board adoption, began to get a complete face-lifting with respect to suspension and expulsion. The most offensive factors were related to that of fighting and bringing deadly weapons to school. Attention was also turned to the writing of specific dress codes and the wearing of long hair. The area of school activities to include club affiliation, social events, and girl sports suffered a tremendous de-emphasis in program solely because minority students were expected to get involved. Once again, the list could be exhaustive, but it would serve no purpose.

Since those times and the crossing of many high hurdles, we now have a better insight of what is happening today within our schools. The impact of school desegregation toward curricular policies and practices has attributed great strides in the direction of serving as a positive agency in education. We have taken on a greater feel for curriculum revision. Within this scope, diagnostic teaching has emerged; teachers are more attuned to the accountability process as well as the establishment of evaluative procedures for students. We have also seen meaningful and more inservice training in the area of teacher education.

The Culturally Different

Having singled out a number of appropriate and related changes that have taken place within the curriculum, the foremost question which comes to my mind is: "What implications do these changes carry for teacher education?" (we are talking about the culturally different now) keeping in mind the emphasis toward curricular policies and practices.

One must take the attitude that this entire matter will never be resolved unless the constituents within the school society become highly sensitive and grosaly involved in providing the kind of advantages--educationally and culturally to meet student needs. Assuredly, this will enable any ethnic group to compete successfully in an interdependent society. I maintain that quality

applicants (irrespective of ethnic groups) be kept a high priority for those entering the field of teacher education. The professionalism and the leadership qualities upheld during the training period certainly will make a significant difference at the completion of their training preparation.

While the curriculum and disciplinary emphasis is all important to teacher preparation, the question of "who will do the job?" cannot go unanswered. I remind you that our point of reference is not doing just any kind of job, but rather "who can do the most effective job possible?"

I am most adamantly suggesting that teacher education programs can prepare young people for the realities of multicultural education. The major thrust in accomplishing this task lies some place between identifying top-flight prospects and discerning their commitment toward doing an outstanding job.

Preparing Teachers for Multicultural Education

Preparing teachers for a multicultural setting is a reality within the domain of overall education. This is supported in the fact that since 1954 we have experienced a tremendous increase in the number and percentage of multi-racial schools throughout the United States. Since the idea of "current trends" in teacher education curriculum is the last concept for consideration when we talk about upgrading an institutional program, there is a danger in describing the atypical model for its successful implementation. This is especially so as we move toward the area of a multicultural education program, because in many instances this philosophy is foreign and new to the educational scene. Yet, there are specific kinds of generalizations that can be applied to an atypical program which will serve to facilitate the analysis and realization of a current teacher program.

Let me describe a few ideas which may be identified as innovative practices and may very well have great implications for teacher preparation.

1. ***Field-centered instruction:*** This approach forces the instructors to confront reality in their teaching. It has always been recognized that by simply having the knowledge does not ensure teacher expertise to create desired student behavior.

2. ***Early field experience:*** Prospective teachers are given opportunities to work within the classroom beginning at the freshman through the senior year. Not only does the trainee get an early exposure to skills that have to be mastered to become an effective teacher, it gives the individual an opportunity to decide if he really wants to teach. The early field experience also enables the trainee to approach the rest of the curriculum from a reality perspective.

3. ***Clinical, laboratory or practicum experience:*** Where other techniques are not feasible, it is important that classroom experience be recreated and brought on site for realistic training purposes. To fulfill this requirement, techniques utilized may very well be that of simulation and microteaching.

4. ***Individualization of instruction:*** More and more programs are providing opportunities for the pursuit of individual goals in learning situations that are different from the norm. This procedure has led to several new teacher education practices. Modularization or minicourses is one aspect and competency-based curriculum is another. Performance-based teacher education has attracted a large number of advocates. A teacher's competency can be measured against objectives and the criteria for their achievement. Thus, demonstrated proficiency becomes the important consideration rather than the accumulation of credits taken in specific courses.

A fifth and final trend lies within the area of:

5. ***Technology in the classroom:*** The increased use of technology has indeed affected teacher training. Audiotape recorders and the videotape recorders are often used in conjunction with techniques such as Flaunders' interaction analysis. Teachers were able to see themselves as their students saw them. They were also able to record their own teaching and analyze their strengths and weaknesses by themselves or with experts.

I am sure that you could probably add to this list other innovations that have expressed implications for teacher education.

In Summary

Let us digress for a moment and retrace our course on what has been said in this presentation. As a result of school desegregation: "What has been the impact upon curricular policies and practices? With this in mind, what is needed to bring about the realities of multicultural education with emphasis on teacher preparation?"

It can be said with confidence that school desegregation attributed to the *awareness* and *consciousness* of mind in the area of curriculum revision. Changes identified were:

Practices:

- Team Teaching
- Differentiated Staffing
- Ability Grouping
- Diagnostic Teaching
- Teacher Accountability
- Behavioral Objectives
- Teacher and Pupil Evaluation
- Increased Utilization of Multi-Ethnic Resource Materials
- Black History
- Ethnic Studies (black)
- Inservice Teacher Training

Policies:

- Discipline
- Suspensions and Expulsion
- Long Hair Guidelines
- Transfer and Leave Policy (teacher and students)
- De-emphasized Sports for Girls
- De-emphasized Student Activities (clubs, social events)

Areas having greater implications for teacher preparation are:

Implications:

- Field Centered Instruction
- Early Field Experience

- Clinical, Laboratory or Practicum Experience
  a. Microteaching
  b. Simulation
- Individualized Instruction
  a. Minicourse
  b. Performance-based education
- Technology in the Classroom
  a. Audiotape recorders
  b. Videotape recorders

As professionals with the potential power to change things in local university settings, I urge teacher educators to swing into motion every possible idea to upgrade their teacher preparation program. When I interview teachers and principals for positions in our school district in the city of Jackson, it never ceases to amaze me that new teacher prospects are not ready to teach. In fact, a greater portion of our time, if not two thirds of the ensuing year, is spent in trying to prepare that teacher for teaching. We have just got to do a better job than that. Professionals should not be afraid to experiment and wield power in the direction of an improved teacher preparation program. Assuredly, the products that are fed the public schools today to join the ranks as teachers of tomorrow, will be no better than the preparational input provided in the services they will be expected to render.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND ITS IMPACT UPON PUPIL PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PRACTICES, AND TEACHER PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

H.B. Pinkney
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
Richmond Public Schools
Richmond, Virginia

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND ITS IMPACT UPON PUPIL PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PRACTICES, AND TEACHER PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

By
H.B. Pinkney

The only justification for the existence of a school is its ability to educate its students.[1]

As we meander through the decade of the 1970's, we all must accept the challenge of making education at all levels viable in what has become a truly multicultural society. Like it or not, unless we as educators are able to live up to the realities of a multicultural education, our system is doomed to failure. We must seriously seek solutions to our problems and get on (beyond the rhetoric) with the business of providing an effective education for all human beings regardless of their cultural backgrounds.

It is of no value to continue identifying problems in education--the challenge is not a continued identification of problems but the offering of specific, understandable solutions. If we are to live together as Americans in a democratic society, we must, through desegregated education, hasten the day that this nation's use of the term "melting pot" does not carry different connotations or expectations merely because one happens to be of a different cultural background. The challenge beyond the "melting pot" uniquely awaits and belongs to educators.

The late Dr. Martin Luther King once said, "We must learn to live together as brothers or perish together as fools." As we examine the realities of multicultural education, we must realize that we are charged with the responsibilities of providing learning experiences for children who, though they are all human beings, are still all uniquely different. Parents and the general public are demanding and will continue to demand that we be held more accountable for the education of all children. The medical doctor does not use the same prescription for all patients; neither can we do this in education for the learning styles or rates of all children. Perhaps in order to

avoid prejudging children—determining their fate at such early age—we all need a daily dose of Dr. Norman Vincent Peale's *The Power of Positive Thinking*, along with Thomas A. Harris' *I'm OK—You're OK*.

However, there are perhaps far too many critics among us—critics who seem to find it very easy to place the blame for all the problems confronting education today right at the "doorstep" of desegregation. This seems to be especially true in the inner city, urban systems or systems with more than 20 percent of a certain cultural group. I do not, I cannot, and I will not agree with those critics who are saying "loud and clear" that public education is a cancerous case, especially in urban areas. The "power of positive thinking" gives me hope that desegregation is still an asset, not a liability, and the future of public education looks as bright as the flowers of spring. Ladies and gentlemen, we have no choice and we cannot hope nor believe any other way.

We must prove false during this decade what Alvin Toffler says in his recent best seller, *Future Shock*, that:

> . . . Evidence mounts that one of our subsystems—Education—is dangerously malfunctioning. What passes for education today in our "best" schools and colleges, is a hopeless anachronism. Parents look to education to fit their children for life in the future. Teachers warn that the lack of an education will cripple a child's chances in the world of tomorrow. . . .
>
> Yet, for all this rhetoric about the future, our schools face backward toward a dying system, rather than forward to the emerging new society.
>
> Their vast energies are applied to cranking out industrial men-people tooled for survival in a system that will be dead before they are.[2]

One could go on and on identifying educators and laymen alike such as Goodman, Conant, and Silberman—the list is endless with those who tend to collectively say that school systems (desegregated, integrated, or call it whatever you may) need a change. There must be alternative programs, void of changes for the sake of change in order to avoid Toffler's *Future Shock* and prepare all children for meaningful niches in a pluralistic society.

As we go forth with desegregation facing the realities of multicultural education, pupil personnel policies and practices, and teacher personnel policies and practices must reflect the changes and needs of this decade. We cannot sit idly by and fail to change our policies and practices to meet the needs of today's youth. One can no longer afford to offer complaints and try to live with policies and practices that served a dual system yesterday and expect for them to fulfill the needs of the "now generation" in a multicultural educational system.

The policies and practices of school personnel, especially the classroom teachers, affect in many different ways the kind of education that we will provide or continue to provide for such diverse cultures in our educational system. Pupil personnel policies and practices of yesterday must be revised and/or changed if they are to be of any value today.

Permit me here to identify what seems to me to be changes that must take place among pupil personnel departments which encompass psychological services, testing, social work services, counseling and guidance, etc. For far too long, even before desegregation, we have been identifying programs, tests and testing that were designed solely for one culture—middle-class white Americans. These instruments have been used over and over again to diagnose, prescribe and even in many cases to prove that those from certain cultural backgrounds were inferior.

It is generally known that for years, guidance counselors have focused their attention and services on too much administration or on only those students who were going to Morehouse or Harvard. However, the record shows that a large percentage of students never arrived on any college or university campus. Counselors must accept the needed change of approach and "deal with" and render service to all students, regardless of whether they are college bound or headed straight for the world of work. Counselors must realize that there are literally hundreds of opportunities for students other than going to college. They, and we, must accept the message and philosophy of one of my favorite writers, John Gardner, as stated in his book, *Excellence*. Gardner states that we must search for talent and develop and pursue excellence for all. He goes on to say that:

> We must expect each student to strive for excellence in terms of the kind of excellence within his reach. We must

> recognize that there may be excellence or shoddiness in every line of human endeavor . . . an excellent plumber is definitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. "The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."[3]

We cannot afford to focus all of our attention on a particular group or subculture. Counselors and other members of the personnel team must shift gears and give full and equal attention and time to all students. Maybe those who are going to Morehouse or Harvard could perhaps very well do without the service or attention of pupil personnel services.

As we continue our testing programs, we must, through research, devise test instruments that will reflect validity and reliability for a multicultural educational program in a desegregated school system. We already know the most important rule is that tests should not be the sole reliance in identifying talent or success of the individual. Judgment and predictions of children's aptitudes and achievements should not be based on test scores alone, but should be based on many kinds of evidence. The important thing to understand and bear in mind is that every known measure of aptitude and achievement has some failings. Only by drawing upon a considerable variety of evidence can we be certain that our judgment is well-rounded and fair to all young people. This is especially true for those who have been labeled as "culturally disadvantaged or culturally deprived."

Test materials too often reflect a certain cultural context or background. It may well be that students know the answers but do not have the cultural context in which to express the answers. Accordingly, the norms, the frame of reference, so important for evaluating tests may not be relevant to some special groups—especially in a multicultural educational setting. Most authorities have agreed that the standardized tests which are administered and relied upon as predictors of success are all culturally biased.

The policies and practices designed and utilized to a large degree in our school systems are somewhat outdated. There are evidences that the curriculum designed yesterday largely for middle-class children has run the gamut and will no longer serve a viable role for desegregation during the 1970's.

The attitudes and beliefs of teachers and administrators in the past that played such a vital role in the formulation of policies and practices will no longer suffice. We must re-evaluate our policies and practices as the need is evidenced in the large number of dropouts. It is reported that in a large urban city system in the East that absenteeism reaches at least 50 percent of the students daily.

There are also evidences that far too many children are reading two or three grade levels below their present grade level. In addition, far too many of them are graduating from high school unable to read. For many of them, the high school diploma merely represents the "bitter end."

Educators must cease playing the role of the "supreme judge" which is evidenced through such comments and beliefs as, "They just don't care," or "They don't want to learn to read." This kind of judgment and complaint generally becomes mere "cop-out" excuses for the purpose of exonerating the teacher and placing the blame on the students. Quite often the blame for many failures can be found sitting behind the "big desk" at the front of the room and nowhere else.

In desegregation, multicultural groups, especially blacks in our educational system, expect and are looking for results, not excuses; for actions, not declarations of good intent; . . . for substance, not form. They are tired of the use of the excuse that they cannot read, but would beg of you as teachers to help them develop their reading skills and thereby learn to read.

In the urban public school system where I serve as assistant superintendent, our superintendent, Dr. Thomas C. Little, has declared an ultimatum on reading. He strongly believes and states openly that he cannot and will not accept the fact that children in an urban or any other system cannot learn to read. The superintendent was quoted recently in the *PTA Magazine* in which he said:

> I'm tired of hearing excuses as to why children in urban schools can't read. I don't believe any of them. . . . I'm convinced that children from an urban school system, particularly children reared in poverty, need to read just as much as—if not more than—so-called advantaged children.[4]

He further states that:

> We cannot afford to have unemployable children coming out of our schools: graduates who cannot follow printed instructions, graduates who cannot understand the terms of a credit purchase, instructions on how to prepare a package of food. . . .[5]

In a formal statement on reading to the School Board, he stated:

> I am convinced that reading must be made the number one academic priority in our schools. Parents have a right to expect it. If we fail to teach children to read, we have tied a millstone to their future.[6]

Dr. Little states emphatically that the children in the Richmond Public Schools will learn to read. To make sure that they will learn to read a rigid remedial reading program has been set up. Teachers are required to take reading courses and reading and curriculum specialists have been hired in all schools. All other services within the system are being brought to bear upon the improvement of reading. Further increments and salary raises will be based on the role played in teaching children to read. He states firmly that he will no longer accept any more excuses about reading for disadvantaged children.

Reading is perhaps the key variable to learning and it must be perceived and taught that way regardless of former policies or practices. However, there are other variables and problems that must be adhered to and addressed. Dr. Kenneth B. Clark states that:

> The starting point is respect. Nothing else that we have to give will help very much if it is offered with a resentful, contemptuous, or patronizing attitude . . . one may assume that if a child is not treated with respect that is due him as a human being, and if those who are charged with the responsibility of teaching him believe that he cannot learn, then his motivation and ability to learn may become impaired. If a teacher believes that a child is incapable of being educated, it is likely that this belief will in some way be communicated to the child in one or more of the many forms of contact inherent in the teacher-pupil relationship.[7]

As we examine our policies and practices and their impact upon an education for all Americans, permit me again to refer to the late Dr. Martin Luther King by using the title of one of his books and proposing a question at the same time. The title and question: *Where Do We Go From Here?* I think Harry L. Miller offers some excellent challenges to us. Permit me to share some of them with you.

1. In most cases, guidance and counseling theory currently favor middle-class mentality. For most black students, the counseling approach is much too passive, verbal, intuitive and seldom accommodates the realities of the blacks' past, present or future. It is necessary to engage in more aggressive counseling. Too often in far too many cases, student personnel workers have failed to address or adopt to the utilization of policies or practices needed for a multicultural educational system.

2. We must stop here and now projecting failure for the disadvantaged or for those who happen to be culturally different. Studies have indicated a low performance expectancy on the part of teachers' acts as a self-fulfilling prophecy. Too often teachers use psychological tools and tests to reinforce and justify low predictions. Again, we must not continue projecting failure for children, especially those in certain cultural groups.

3. We must shift from overly slick professionalism of the pedagogue and work on the "helper" principle. One must reach out and help someone before he can really teach someone. Many students respond more favorably to helping than to a purely professional approach.

4. Teachers must be made more comfortable and less emotionally involved in teaching the poor and the disadvantaged or those who are culturally different. Using the "participatory experience," teachers can be helped to gain some insights concerning themselves, how they perceive others, and how others perceive them.

5. And teaching styles, as Riesman points out, will need to accommodate the manageable response and styles of all children (culturally deprived, disadvantaged or the poor) if we hope to

individualize the teaching-learning process. It is here that the instructional program must reflect positive changes.

Finally, as we face the realities of the educational needs for what has been labeled as the "cool generation," our policies and practices must change. There must be evidence through some means of "belongingness" on the part of all children regardless of their cultural backgrounds. We cannot and we must not let the physical appearances of this decade—long hair, plaited hair, Woodstock, drug culture, skin color, the clenched fist, hippies, or other characteristics that are so prevalent today—cause us to give up or refrain from providing for the unique educational needs of today's youth. People are uniquely different and we must be about "our father's business" of providing an education for all of them.

FOOTNOTES

[1]James C. Sargent, *Organizational Climate of High Schools*, Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc. (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1967), p. 2.

[2]Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1971), pp. 398-99.

[3]John W. Gardner, *Excellence* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), p. 86.

[4]Robert P. Hilldrup, "Richmond is for Readers, Thanks to Dr. Little," *The PTA Magazine*, Vol. 68, No. 2 (October, 1973), pp. 30-31.

[5]*Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.

[6]School Board Minutes (February 8, 1973), p. 35.

[7]A. Harry Passow, editor, *Education In Depressed Areas* (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1963), p. 149.

SOME BASIC UNDERSTANDINGS:

TOWARD MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION

Florence Lovell Roane
Chairman, Division of Education
Bethune-Cookman College

SOME BASIC UNDERSTANDINGS:

TOWARD MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION

By
Florence Lovell Roane

From five basic assumptions, the understandings for the teaching-learning process in multi-ethnic education may be derived. The preprofessional group may be led to examine these basic assumptions and their derivatives as a part of their practical experiences prior to student-teaching and responsible teaching. These basic assumptions undergird the planning to be done in preparation for teaching, while at the same time they may be perceived to be parts of individualized teaching strategies. From them may be derived also the individual teacher's conceptualizations of human attitudes and human values, since these are the major components of whatever may be the best adaptive form of multi-ethnic education in the schools.

In the first place, they must realize fully that *all* children experience the basic developmental tasks. All children pass through the same progressive changes that come to human beings as they pass from infancy to maturity. There are certain characteristic modes of behavior expected during this growth process. The teacher must always keep in mind this human factor and that the individual grows as a feeling-thinking human being. Even when we accept the individuality with which different human beings respond to these feeling-thinking areas of life, we must realize that all children grow and mature through these processes. as we recognize widespread discussions of cultural diversity and cultural pluralism, it is equally important to recognize the human factors which make all cultures or ethnic groups equally worthy of respect and understanding by those who teach. The expectancies must be projected through wide perspectives that allow outreach for all students. These young ones are "so much of what one expects" during the early years of learning.

The second basic assumption is that the human being lives in what we know as the human community and is the creator of human culture. The needs of humanity are met through the interaction of the human being with other human beings and usually through institutions of many kinds. The

school is one such institution. In America, the most far-reaching and extensive educational program has centered in a principle that led us to believe, "all men are educable." In recent years our efforts to meet this belief have not been met with satisfaction. Since desegregation, we have attributed many of the problems, now encountered, as coming from the idea of mixed cultures, particularly those of the black and of the white.

There is a sense in which the factor of slavery hangs like a dismal curtain over the entire plan. The myths which accrued from slavery fill the minds of Americans and inhibit our efforts to give all people the status of being HUMAN. In fact, the institutions designed to promote the democratic ethos, have had difficulty assessing the status of the black man as that of "fully human." All too often, their actions belie their words.

The black man, with the mark of oppression upon him has often accepted the "inferior" role, thereby adding more status to the "superiority" role of the white. The educative process is required to accept this basic assumption as a challenge, and organize the work of the educational institutions in such a way that they may help to move the status of the black group from the ancient role of "chattel" to that of "human being."

The first move toward this kind of realization was in the direction of labels like "disadvantaged," "culturally deprived," etc. This only said, "you are human, but you are a culturally deprived human." This label did not add status.

The third basic assumption is that the psycho-social processes through which human beings pass have caused different stresses in the mixed schools; the kinds of responses that come naturally to human beings are not acceptable in the frame of reference of the schools as they function in the American society. The crises and stresses, known to many as "racial conflicts" were not looked upon as behaviors from one group of children or youth to another group of children or youth—but in terms of one race group to another. The everyday responses that human beings normally give to each other in the give-and-take of living and being have been assessed with the overtones of "race" or "ethnic background" or "cultural difference." Reinhold Niebuhr, in his book, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, described the problem of the democratic ethos in these words:

> Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary. (From the foreword.)

In Chapter 6 of Jules Karlin's book on *Man's Behavior*, the distinctions between prejudice and discrimination are made clear.

> Prejudice refers to a learned cultural pattern involving attitudes, not easily changed and immune from direct frontal attack.
>
> Discrimination, on the other hand, describes a specific over action, such as keeping Negroes out of schools, or denying them their constitutional right. . . .

The author indicates that *discrimination can be directly* attacked, particularly in a country where democratic ideals prevail. . . .

We do see that as the years go by many forms of discrimination have been attacked. . . .

Impact of the social crisis on the behavior of people—children and teachers and all associated with the schools—has caused psychological problems, bringing into focus high risks of infringement upon human teaching. Such practices effect all children under its influence. According to Erikson, we enculturate *basic* mistrust instead of *basic* trust; shame and doubt instead of initiative, independence, sureness of the growing person's control; guilt instead of cooperation and healthful imagination and inferiority instead of industriousness.

The fourth basic assumption is that preprofessionals and classroom teachers, paraprofessionals and guidance personnel, and all who work with multi-ethnic groups are under obligation to understand the process of socialization. They need to see it as a scientific understanding and as a practical ingredient of their work in the schools. They need to know it as the "process by which human children born potentially human become human, able to function within the societies in which they are born."

The patterns of enculturation found in the multi-cultural classroom

may be the point of departure for making learning come alive in the children. Knowing the patterns of enculturation is the place to begin whatever acculturation may be desired, in which these very adaptable youngsters begin to explore the languages, songs, games, beliefs, imaginations and hopes of another group. Since there may be as many as five different ethnic groups in one classroom under one teacher, herein, we find a fertile opportunity for many appreciations, skills, interests, ideas and inquiries which will broaden the perspectives and the learning outreach simultaneously.

The fifth basic assumption deals with self-identity. This is a human matter as well. The black child in particular needs to first know acceptance as a human being, but most of all he must learn self-acceptance. Many barriers may be removed when these children learn to see that their color, hair, and natural features are "all right." When he learns to look identifyingly at himself, and like himself, then he will begin to look across at others with more sensitivity to acceptance of the others. This, of course, is basically the theme of Dr. Harris' *I'm OK – You're Ok*. But it needs teaching and developing through the design of *certain models* that can effectively establish an environment for the emergence of self-acceptance.

One set of models must be created to deal with language. Norman Cousins in an editorial some years ago, mentions the fact that "language is an instrument; it is even more an environment." Julian Huxley said that the words men use not only express but shape their ideas.

When the children begin to talk they imitate the language of those whom they first hear in speech. When they come to pre-school and in the primary grades, it would seem psychologically helpful if they could be allowed to tell what they want to express in whatever language, they can say it. . . . The full intent is to preserve their enthusiasm and self-image at the moment. The teacher can practice repeating what is said in a desirable form but only to encourage imitation. The teacher seeks to preserve a continuum of experiences during these early growth years, and therefore, the "forms" to be used take second place; the ideas to be expressed, the experience to be related takes priority. The content of the child's experiences to be "listened to." It seems that the language-experience approach preserves personality wholeness and gives rise to status more fully. This is much needed by the black child, as well as others who are unstable, because of lack of belonging, love and esteem. To follow Abraham Maslow's, *Toward a Psychology of*

Being, the patterns of language development which nurture self-esteem, feeling of belonging and care are the ones to be followed at first. As language practices are pursued in later school years, more and more the learning processes and models will involve the child and the youth in language patterns which help him to discover the kinds of speech identified with who he is, who he is becoming and more particularly, the job-opportunity world. The difference in patterns will then be associated with need.

Some models for dealing with this problem are explored in a book by William W. Joyce and James A. Banks, *Teaching the Language Arts to Culturally Different Children* (Addison-Wesley, 1971). These editors are themselves one from the white culture and one from the black; they have examined alternatives. One essay in that book is by Kenneth R. Johnson which presents some teaching strategies for *models* in this area.

Identity, self-acceptance and self-esteem come from the learner's opportunity to (1) advance an idea and have it accepted; (2) ask a question—especially one that is in response to a YOU-question asked of him; (3) make response to a YOU-question in which he feels that the teacher will find his response worthy of consideration, by reason of the attitude expressed when the inquiry said, "And what would YOU do about that, Reginald?" The teacher is able to find suitable "acceptance words"; when praise is not thought to be just the right thing at that moment. Also, the learner's contribution may be viewed as a possible alternative to be further explored by the class or a group in the class.

Also, as E.T. Hall points out in the *Silent Language*, the teacher's response may not be in words at all, but in a significant facial or bodily expression that has the same healthy effect upon the learner.

The teacher is the significant one, and the learners wish for this response from the significant one more than from anyone else.

During 1965, we learned much about the Flanders system of interaction analysis. It projected the concern for verbal interaction of teachers and learners. This would seem to be a very desirable model for classrooms, now mixed but with very little response from the black students. Especially in the high schools one finds many black students non-participatory in the classroom activities.

In the Flanders model pupil growth toward the realization of self-esteem is the result of relational responses between the teacher's behavior and the pupil's behavior. One may see this as the teacher's environment lifting the tone of the class and giving opportunity for pupil-environment to feel secure and expressive.

The system demonstrates, the direct influences as those in which the teacher *minimizes* to the greatest possible degree the teacher's direction of pupils and allows them to make choices; avoids negative tones and creates the positive attitude; avoids lecturing, criticizing and authoritative movements.

The positive influences are indirect but contributing to esteem:

- practices of encouragement
- use of the ideas advanced by the learners
- acceptance of the feelings of learners
- a continuous spirit of inquiry.

The best classroom environment for development of "knowing" is one that lingers on after the school day is ended. When the learner has been led through the classroom activity to discover ideas on his own; to experience value, and truth, and delight; to be appreciated and to have chance to show appreciation—"wanting to know" is alive; the self feels worthy.

Another Model

Since black children live forever under the aegis that their freedom must be earned, and that they must get on with this search for freedom as individuals, a model for freedom is desired from grades K-12. This model is geared for experiences that involve the learner in freedoms that enhance self-acceptance and self-identity. The model would be more desirable if it were associated with something creative.

- The learner has freedom to choose a course of action, experiment, or other;
- The learner has a freedom to examine alternative viewpoints in an issue or concern;
- The learner has freedom to show appreciation for individual

differences in people, institutions, some act or government or other.

For the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, Robert R. Leeper was editor of the book, *Humanizing Education: The Person in the Process* (ASCD, 1967). One area in the book explores the Climate for Humaneness as presented by Chris Argyris (Yale School of Industrial Management—Organization and Innovation). A model for preprofessionals and teachers in service may well be created under this theme as it is explored by Argyris . . . dealing with establishing *openness* of climate in the school, so that feelings can be explored; a concern for receptivity and individuality and thirdly the development of "trust." This kind of model may require much time and expertise but it is definitely needed in the multi-cultural setting.

Another Model

Learners at each level (K-12) and at a higher degree of sensitivity in teacher preparation levels, can participate in dialogue. The kind of dialogue that we need is supportive of the four wider goals of education and whatever classroom goals support the major ones.

Because people in society need to *talk* with each other, people growing up to assume the participatory role in democracy need to learn the art of dialogue.

According to Ruell L. Howe in *The Miracle of Dialogue* (New York, The Seabury Press, 1966), dialogue means that we spend more time in helping people of difference to talk with each other.

Barriers of inferiority, superiority and inequalities may be removed. The status of the individual is increased when the individual finds out that he is related to another person in a meaningful way or that he has encountered a responsibility to a cause in which he finds others. We learn to face issues.

A Model Symbol

A multicultural symbol must emerge. Not a sign, because a sign is not a symbol. Symbols grow out of times that ripen them for the people who need

them. They draw a response from the people who need them.

In Arthur Smith's book on *Transracial Communication*, he indicates that the "imposition of a single symbol system onto a multi-ethnic population is one way to describe American society." This "symbolic imperialism" needs to be transplanted by a symbol that will "normalize communication between differing and different people.

The values and potentials of a multi-cultural society may become more thoroughly blended through the schools that recognize the beauty of variety and use such appreciation of difference to enrich the human society.

REFERENCES

Burns, Paul C. and Leo M. Schell. *Elementary School Language Arts.* New York: Rand McNally & Company, 1973.

Clark, Kenneth B. *Prejudice and Your Child* (2nd edition). Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Duncan, Hugh D. *Symbols in Society.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Harris, Thomas A. *I'm OK—You're OK.* New York and Evanston: Harper & Row Publishers, 1969.

Ianni, Francis A.J. and Edward Storey. *Cultural Relevance and Educational Issues Readings in Anthropology and Education.*

Joyce, William W. and James A. Banks. *Teaching the Language Arts to Culturally Different Children.* New York: Addison-Wesley, 1971.

Lair, Jess. "I Ain't Much, Baby—But I'm All I've Got." New York: Doubleday and Company, 1972.

Logan, Lillian M., Virgil G. Logan and Leona Patterson. *Creative Communication: Teaching the Language Arts.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Mead, Margaret. *Culture and Commitment.* New York: Doubleday and Company, 1970.

Smith, Arthur L. *Transracial Communication.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Stent, Madelon D., William R. Hazard and Harry N. Rivlin. *Cultural Pluralism in Education: A Mandate for Change.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Williams, Thomas R. *Introduction to Socialization Human Culture Transmitted.* St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Company, 1972.

NO ONE MODEL AMERICAN

American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education

NO ONE MODEL AMERICAN

A Statement on Multicultural Education

In an action reflecting its commitment to alleviating social problems through education, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education established the Commission on Multicultural Education. The Commission, formed in the aftermath of the Kent State and Jackson State tragedies, is the outgrowth of the Association's long history of involvement in building a more effective and humane society through the betterment of teacher education.

The Multicultural Statement is a significant product of the Commission's work. The Statement, which was adopted officially in November, 1972, by the AACTE Board of Directors, was prepared for AACTE, its member institutions, and other centers of higher learning as a guide for addressing the issue of multicultural education.

Commission members caution that the term "multicultural" is not an euphemism for "disadvantaged." Rather, the Statement encompasses broad ethnic and cultural spheres.

The Statement, a product of Commission interaction with a number of higher education institutions and personnel, is presented here in the interest of improving the quality of society through an increased social awareness on the part of teachers and teacher educators.

Text of Multicultural Statement

Multicultural education is education which values cultural pluralism. Multicultural education rejects the view that schools should seek to melt away cultural differences or the view that schools should merely tolerate cultural pluralism. Instead, multicultural education affirms that schools should be oriented toward the cultural enrichment of all children and youth through programs rooted to the preservation and extension of cultural alternatives. Multicultural education recognizes cultural diversity as a fact of life in American society, and it affirms that this cultural diversity is a valuable

resource that should be preserved and extended. It affirms that major education institutions should strive to preserve and enhance cultural pluralism.

To endorse cultural pluralism is to endorse the principle that there is no one model American. To endorse cultural pluralism is to understand and appreciate the differences that exist among the nation's citizens. It is to see these differences as a positive force in the continuing development of a society which professes a wholesome respect for the intrinsic worth of every individual. Cultural pluralism is more than a temporary accommodation to placate racial and ethnic minorities. It is a concept that aims toward a heightened sense of being and of wholeness of the entire society based on the unique strengths of each of its parts.

Cultural pluralism rejects both assimilation and separatism as ultimate goals. The positive elements of a culturally pluralistic society will be realized only if there is a healthy interaction among the diverse groups which comprise the nation's citizenry. Such interaction enables all to share in the richness of America's multicultural heritage. Such interaction provides a means for coping with intercultural tensions that are natural and cannot be avoided in a growing, dynamic society. To accept cultural pluralism is to recognize that no group lives in a vacuum—that each group exists as part of an interrelated whole.

If cultural pluralism is so basic a quality of our culture, it must become an integral part of the educational process at every level. Education for cultural pluralism includes four major thrusts: (1) the teaching of values which support cultural diversity and individual uniqueness; (2) the encouragement of the qualitative expansion of existing ethnic cultures and their incorporation into the mainstream of American socioeconomic and political life; (3) the support of explorations in alternative and emerging life styles; and (4) the encouragement of multiculturalism, multilingualism, and multidialectism. While schools must insure that all students are assisted in developing their skills to function effectively in society, such a commitment should not imply or permit the denigration of cultural differences.

Educational institutions play a major role in shaping the attitudes and beliefs of the nation's youth. These institutions bear the heavy task of preparing each generation to assume the rights and responsibilities of adult life. In helping the transition to a society that values cultural pluralism, educational

institutions must provide leadership for the development of individual commitment to a social system where individual worth and dignity are fundamental tenets. This provision means that schools and colleges must assure that their total educational process and educational content reflect a commitment to cultural pluralism. In addition, special emphasis programs must be provided where all students are helped to understand that being different connotes neither superiority nor inferiority; programs where students of various social and ethnic backgrounds may learn freely from one another; programs that help different minority students understand who they are, where they are going, and how they can make their contribution to the society in which they live.

Colleges and universities engaged in the preparation of teachers have a central role in the positive development of our culturally pluralistic society. If cultural pluralism is to become an integral part of the educational process, teachers and personnel must be prepared in an environment where the commitment includes such factors as a faculty and staff of multiethnic and multiracial character, a student body that is representative of the culturally diverse nature of the community being served, and a culturally pluralistic curriculum that accurately represents the diverse multicultural nature of American society.

Multicultural education programs for teachers are more than special courses or special learning experiences grafted onto the standard program. The commitment to cultural pluralism must permeate all areas of the educational experience provided for prospective teachers.

Multicultural education reaches beyond awareness and understanding of cultural differences. More important than the acceptance and support of these differences is the recognition of the right of these different cultures to exist. The goal of cultural pluralism can be achieved only if there is full recognition of cultural differences and an effective educational program that makes cultural equality real and meaningful. The attainment of this goal will bring a richness and quality of life that would be a long step toward realizing the democratic ideals so nobly proclaimed by the founding fathers of this nation.

"IS THE GLASS HALF-EMPTY OR HALF-FILLED?" IS MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION A RESPONSE TO A GENUINE CONCERN FOR THE ENHANCED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES OF ALL OR IS IT ANOTHER SLOGAN?

Paul Mohr

"IS THE GLASS HALF-EMPTY OR HALF-FILLED?" IS MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION A RESPONSE TO A GENUINE CONCERN FOR THE ENHANCED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES OF ALL OR IS IT ANOTHER SLOGAN?

By
Paul B. Mohr

Today we have before us "No One Model American," a statement on multicultural education which was prepared by the members of the AACTE's Commission on Multicultural Education. It is a "manifesto" such that, when presented, one can easily be moved either by the grandiloquence of the speaker on that topic or by the substance of the Statement itself.

I have often reflected upon the contents of the Statement and I have been seized with moments of hope at times, and then at other moments with despair. I have often asked myself—Is this statement another exercise in futility, or is it a launching pad for a total commitment on the part of AACTE and its constituents to a genuine concern for God's children of the world, be they "brown, yellow, black or white," for after all as the song implies, "they are precious in His sight." (Please forgive the moment of nostalgia, but I am reminded of a song we learned when I was a child, "Jesus Loves All the Children of the World," which alludes to much of what the Statement intends to reflect.)

Between my moments of hope and despair, I keep recycling the theme, "Is the Glass Half-Empty or Is It Half-Filled?" Are we here today to react to a crisis situation as evidenced by the chaotic conditions of the public school systems, or are we here to "get on the good foot" by heralding the multicultural statement as the embodiment of the modern-day ten commandments in which we enrichen our lives by enhancing educational opportunities for all?

Are we here at this meeting to talk about multicultural education just

to be fashionable? Are we talking about "No One Model American" because this is a pedagogical fad wrapped up in professional jargon in which we can do some ego tripping by engaging in esoteric conversations that are similar to many educational endeavors—"full of sound and fury," yet signifying nothing.

Does the statement on multicultural education really imbue us with the firm professional dedication that will enable us to assume far greater leadership in strengthening our teacher education programs in order that our products can give more than life service to multicultural education?

Is the glass half-empty or is it half-filled?

I raise all of these questions because I think there is a stinging indictment against many of us for not creating and perpetuating the kind of system we seek to promulgate. The literature is full of references to our failure to get right with ourselves first, and then to do justice to our constituents.

Racism vs. Ethnocentrism

There is another nagging thought that provokes my concern; that is, are we really addressing ourselves to obliterating racism or ethnocentrism? "Essentially 'ethnocentrism' means not understanding people different from oneself. It is a form of cultural nearsightedness or cultural astigmatism. Ethnocentrism is a preoccupation with one's own cultural subgroup, a lack of awareness of other cultures, of man in other settings, of different ways of being human." Ethnocentrism takes on a globalized perspective when viewed against the background of international affairs. The increasingly interdependent nature of the modern world places a heavy burden on the educational systems of all nations to reduce ethnocentrism. This becomes even more meaningful when we consider the fact that by the year 2000, five billion of six billion people who live on earth will be non-white, whatever that means.

A more dramatic expression of the point I wish to make is the fact that the United States has provided almost one hundred years of schooling for the Sioux Indian nation with mostly non-Lakota-speaking teachers. The result has been a 100 percent dropout rate during that same period of time.

The American branch of ethnocentrism or the acculturation of the Indian nation has produced some other results:

1. The loss of 90 million acres of land since 1887;
2. Reduction of the average life expectancy to a mere 44 years;
3. A dropout rate that is twice that of the national average;
4. A nation with 60 percent of the people having less than an eighth grade education;
5. Seventy-five percent of the people with incomes of less than $3,000;
6. Forty percent of the people who are unemployed.

I am reminded that a similar description was made of people who were a part of the Watts Revolution.

Indians have yet to reach that level of frustration. However, they have gotten around to displaying automobile stickers that state "Custer had it coming."

That ugly phrase "white racism" appears to be like a ghost, you try to close your eyes in the hopes that it will go away. However, too many publications have dealt with this issue. Consequently, I feel compelled to present the issue, fortified by the contents of *Institutional Racism in America, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Teachers for the Real World, America's Other Children*, and *Crisis in the Classroom.*

Dr. James Beck of the FAMU Florida School Desegregation Consulting Center suggests that "No One Model American" is deficient in its scope and potential for the particular reason that "it fails to recognize and address itself to the basic underlying cause of why cultural pluralism and multi-ethnic education are primarily missing in our institution in the first place. The basic cause to which I refer is institutionalized white racism. Institutionalized racism here refers to those policies, practices, norms, and expectations which operate and serve the interest and advantage of white people, and are antithetical to the goals of multicultural education."

"To believe that viable programs of multicultural education can be developed without first dealing with white racism is an illusion. For example, the failure of many compensatory education programs and innovative

techniques which were designed to promote equal opportunities, respect for individual, humanism, etc., demonstrates the inevitable disaster of focusing on the manifest weakness rather than upon the basic structural force which perpetuated the weakness in the first place.'

I feel that the AACTE Statement, if related in a meaningful way with systematic strategy of eliminating white racism, would be a far more useful document.

Educational Institutions and Multicultural Education

A part of the *Statement on Multicultural Education* focuses upon the educational institutions that "play a major role in shaping the attitudes and beliefs of the nation's youth." In playing that major role, we again must recognize that we are producing graduates who confuse race, class, and ethnic bias with academic standards. Further, our graduates are being placed in school systems that reinforce racism overtly and covertly, some of which happens to be accomplished by the omission and insensitivity that the authors of the aforementioned publications report.

We note in "No One Model American" that cultural pluralism rejects assimilation and separatism as ultimate goals. However, we should observe that black separatism is a manifestation of frustration with the system for pretending to ameliorate social ills, yet permitting a license to continue doing business as usual. A good example is the so-called integration of universities. The mere fact of saying our schools are integrated is no *sine qua non* for enriched educational opportunities. The confrontation at Cornell attests to this. Ken Clarke further substantiates this contention by asserting that the white institutions have proven to be psychologically insecure for many black students. Perhaps this is a result of not making the climate conducive for the appropriate exploitation of university resources by the black students.

Quite sometime ago, Carl Rowan wrote of black separatism as "a montage of the plainly sensible and the patently absurd. It is replete with contradictions, born of pride and insecurity, loneliness and mob psychology, a new sense of power and new feelings of impotence. It is a tragic indicator that black people in America today have only hazy goals, and no real hope of reaching them."

Rowan also spoke of the need for intellectual security among blacks as inducing the demand for black studies taught by blacks and for black students only. Here, again, we raise the question, is the glass half-empty, or is it half-filled? Did institutions attempt to provide social security or intellectual security or was Black Studies an "opiate" enabling students to get on a racial "cloud nine" that provided a temporary sensation?

Many of us can agree that few universities wanted to legitimize black studies. Some saw it as a temporary system "grafted" onto a curriculum to be dissipated by time and attention to more popular interests.

We need to be reminded that the establishment of ethnic centers—be they black, Mexican, or Indian—is a necessity for the development of racial pride. It is necessary because history has obliterated our contribution to mankind. It also is necessary because the survival of mankind is predicated upon our acceptance of every man.

It is only fitting that I recognize the dilemma that exists relative to enhancing educational opportunities for all. The problem is so pervasive and elusive that we educators hardly know how to deal with it. We have tried to use various terms and phrases to describe the condition. We began with the concept of bi-racial education and cross-cultural education. Now, we are confronted with such terms as multicultural, multi-ethnic, interethnic, and intercultural, as opposed to ethnocentrism.

This leads me to believe that many of us who are unconvinced feel there is a need to study the need for multicultural education. We ask: Is the problem a problem or is the purpose for presenting the problem purposive enough to warrant attention?

If there is a need to study the need, will the redundancy be reiterated as reported in *Teachers for the Real World?*

Moreover, are we to be engulfed in difficult declensions and pretentious paradigms characterized by most professors? As you know, most university professors who profess to a particular position in this matter of multicultural education prefer to acknowledge anonymity to the callous colleagues of our company.

Taking advantage of the opportunity to further paraphrase B.E. Martin who reports on "A Study of the Study," are we to prematurely conclude that the problem of multicultural education is concluded when a clear and concise compedium of conclusions is brought to a close?

In conclusion, I wish to quote the words of Paulo Freire who said, "No pedagogy which is truly liberating can remain distant from the oppressed by treating them as unfortunates and by presenting for their emulation models from among the oppressors." Education, in Freire's words, becomes "the practice of freedom," the means by which we deal critically and creatively with reality.

"No One Model American," a provocative statement, can become a working document or a dormant documentary such as the Kerner Report. It remains with us to seek our date with destiny by losing ourselves in the cause of multicultural education.

REFERENCES

Cottle, Thomas J. *Time's Children.* Boston, Massachusetts: Little, Brown & Company, 1971.

Henderson, George, ed. *America's Other Children.* Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971.

Knowles, Louis L. and Kenneth Prewitt, eds. *Institutional Racism in America.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Martin, B.E. "A Study of the Study," *SRIS,* Winter, 1972, p. 21.

Rowan, Carl T. and David M. Maize. "The Growth of Black Separatism—A National Tragedy," *Reader's Digest,* November, 1972, p. 3.

Smith, B. Othanel. *Teachers for the Real World.* Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, September, 1969.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

HUMANISM AND THE CLASSROOM TEACHER

Paul Mohr

HUMANISM AND THE CLASSROOM TEACHER

By
Paul B. Mohr

The concept of humanism in the public school system has become highly popular within the past decade. Some authority figures trace this concept to a great dissatisfaction or disaffection with schools that were established for the mass production of graduates, minimizing individuality and freedom. Consequently, the humanistic school emerged with major emphasis on the affective dimensions of learning. Humanistic schools cannot be void of humanistic teachers. Consequently, this brief presentation will focus upon "Humanism and the Classroom Teacher."

Role Models

Rather than deal with the presentation in an abstract, theoretical manner, it appears to be rather appropriate to single out specific role models that cut across racial, ethnic and cultural lives inasmuch as they represent a microcosm of a cadre of teachers who "buck the odds" daily. Martha Marian Stringfellow, a South Carolinian who was named teacher of the year in 1971 by *Look Magazine* and the Council of Chief State School Officers immediately comes to mind. I guess I want to be lavish in praise of her because I vividly recall how one of her students described Mrs. Stringfellow who is white. The student wrote former President Nixon: "I am one of the black children in Mrs. Stringfellow's class. She make me feel important. She love us all."

Martha looked upon her first graders at Lewisville Elementary School in Chester County as individuals. She sees all students as individuals who "come to you with a feeling of trust, and that's the first thing you've got to do—get them to trust you," she said. As I continued to marvel about Martha's accomplishments while writing this speech, I remembered what Bunnie Smith stated in *Teachers For the Real World*. He said, "Our teaching can become more humanized if we recognize differences." Martha recognized that her students were different than those she taught twenty years prior to her return to the classroom in the 60's. She felt they were ". . . harder, lacking closeness," and

they seemed to need help. As a result, she set about to create "relaxed learning situations," using as prime tools praise and gentle prompting.

Another paradigm of humanism appeared when Kha Dennard, a FAMU graduate, was selected as Palm Beach County Teacher of the Year for 1974. This black teacher was described by youngsters in her fourth grade gifted class as strict. However, reporters who interviewed her students acknowledged that it was a special kind of strictness, undergirded with an obvious concern for each student as an individual. They further report that it's a strictness which seems to be enjoyed even by the students who mentioned it.

Chris Kane said, "I think Mrs. Dennard is nice. She's more stricter than other teachers and she won't let anyone get away with something."

Here, we have two models of humanism. One model is dramatized by a skillful white teacher working with disadvantaged blacks in a rural South Carolina County. Another model is personified by an innovative, dedicated black teacher who is highly successful with gifted children in affluent Palm Beach County that are assigned to her school from the town and other areas.

These are two role models that are worthy of emulation. While I extol their accomplishments, I hasten to say that they are but a microcosm of the humanism that flows from teacher to student. I suppose that we can draw many conclusions about humanism from the role models I presented. One conclusion is: The teacher is the center of humanism in the classroom.

a. She stands as a centrifugal of humanism in that her attributes of humanism flow from her to reach those whom she teaches.
b. She stands as a centripetal of humanism in which her attributes of humanism illicit appropriate student response to her.

Humanism Described

But what is this elusive thing called humanism? Webster describes it essentially as a manifestation of having the feelings and dispositions proper to mankind: benevolent, tender, merciful. If we could accept such an oversimplified definition, there would hardly be any need for today's discussion. However, the mere fact that humanism also has the connotation of the denial

of the divinity of Christ, and the maintenance of the perfectibility of human nature without the aid of grace, makes the topic of Humanism more of a necessity than a luxury. In the name of humanism, we have done some strange things to our fellow-man! In the name of Christianity we have done some strange things to our fellow-man! This has been accomplished because we have interpreted these concepts for our own good rather than for the good of others.

Historical Context

If we place the concept of humanism in a historical context, we get a strong justification for the perennial concerns of humanism. As far as America is concerned, some forefathers who came here as English immigrants seeking freedom from religious intolerance, actually imposed religious intolerance upon the native Americans who were already here.

> The goals of the Virginia Colony, for instance, were . . . first to preach and baptize into Christian Religion and by propogation of the Gospell, to recover out of the arms of the Divell, a number of poore and miserable soules, wrapt up unto death, in almost invinceable ignorance . . . and to add out myte to the Treasurey of Heaven.

The religious fanaticism of the English immigrants forced them to believe that the native American's ignorance of the English God meant inferiority on the part of native Americans. From the justificatory ideology of the English immigrants came the syndrome, "The only good Indian is a dead Indian."

One can observe that the fall-out of the native American-English immigrant conflict was the evolution of monoculturalism in which the culture of the native American was an alien culture. Consequently, we became embroiled in ethnocentrism. Here again, we must convey the subtle connotation of ethnocentrism as believing that one's own race is superior.

The ideas of ethnocentrism and monoculturalism were driving forces in the implementation of the melting pot concept of America where people of diverse ethnic backgrounds (people having the same physical and cultural

traits) were assimilated into one big super culture. For a time, the melting pot concept was popular because the dominant culture had a kind of cavalier benevolence toward the oppressed who were concerned more with survival than with assimilation.

While survival was the key theme of the first generation of immigrants, the second generation thought they heard the siren call of welcome to the social cliques, clubs, and institutions of the Host Culture. Many of them reasoned that Ivy League manners and behavior, and a Brooks Brothers suit would enable them to enjoy the accoutrements, the personal benefits of the Host Culture. Unfortunately, that kind of assimilation into mainstream culture did not suffice.

As a result of rejection in this manner, many ethnic enclaves developed and monoculturalism was neutralized partially by the concept of biculturalism. As we make additional historical recollections we recognize that the past decade has produced a call for multiculturalism and the remnants of humanism.

Wars that threw cultures together in order to survive and conquer, revolutions that polarized cultures, and modern technology that drew cultures together, signaled the need for concentrated efforts of humanism. The boundaries of the United States may well have been sufficient for band-aid treatments of multiculturalism because a dominant culture still prevails stateside. The international dimension, so often overlooked, has enlarged the focus to humanism, however.

Pearl, Burns and Foster, in their introductory chapter to *Teachers for the Real World*, report:

> The world we live in is overwhelmingly non-white. By the year 2000, five billion of the six billion people who live on the earth will be non-white. (Non-white is not a precise description of skin color but rather a designation of those people who, until recently, lived under the control of colonial powers.) Political power is growing in the east and the south. Asia, Africa, and South America are the areas of greatest population growth and potential economic development. For the United States these

awesome facts meant that we must learn to find an accommodation with the non-white world different from that attempted in the past.

The authors assert, in essence, that humanism is more a matter of survival rather than one of economic interest. Therefore, the classroom teacher should see herself as one functioning in a setting that is conducive to making every student a citizen who contributes to the whole of society, rather than that portion of society the teacher was born and raised in.

If the rationale for pursuing the theme of Humanism and the Classroom Teacher has not been as forceful, let me repeat for emphasis that how well we deal with our students and ourselves will determine what legacy we leave the next generation.

"Humanism" Characteristics

Earlier, I gave two shining examples of teachers whom I thought instilled humanism in their classrooms. I did so from the frame of reference that the teacher is the center of humanism. From the success stories of Martha and Kha, I tried to develop a shopping list of characteristics of humanism. In developing that shopping list, I compared it with one developed by public school officials. From a list of 206 descriptive terms found on student teaching evaluation forms of 328 NCATE-accredited institutions, the public school officials rated 29 terms as having the greatest value for predicting success. Using this check list I determined that Martha and Kha had such attributes as:

Enthusiasm – First of all it appeared that the two had overall enthusiasm. Secondly, they were enthusiastic about teaching, and thirdly, they appeared to be able to stimulate enthusiasm among their pupils.

Respect – Respect for pupils and respect of pupils. Such respect enabled them to provide for individual differences, to be fair and consistent, and to have an understanding and interest in their pupils. Further, the reciprocation of respect enabled the two outstanding teachers to have good teacher-pupil rapport tact, and the ability to solicit pupil cooperation.

Emotionalism – What kind of emotionalism do Martha and Kha have? I would surmise that theirs was the kind that was characterized by stability, maturity, a proper attitude, and mental alertness.

Competence – Certainly these two role models were competent in the technical sense that they had good teaching skills, had good knowledge of subject matter, exhibited a desire to improve, were well organized and had control of their classrooms.

I think we can pursue the matter of characteristics among humanistic teachers if we consider what some authority figures say about humanism. Alton Harrison of Northern Illinois University has forged a personal individualized-humanistic philosophy of education in which he asserts:

> I have come to believe that each person is born with a unique potential and that education should not only respect this individuality, but create programs conducive to its growth. I believe that learning is natural for man; that every individual is motivated by natural curiosity and a desire for inner peace and happiness. Like Emerson, I am convinced that learning could and should be an enjoyable experience. While recognizing the importance of cognitive development in education, I regard affective development to be of equal importance.

Carl Rogers, in his work *Freedom to Learn*, states:

> The facilitation of significant learning rests upon certain attitudinal qualities which exist in the personal relationship between the facilitator and the learner.

Rogers does not see the facilitation of learning as being necessarily a function of teaching skills, curricular planning, use of audio visual aids, programmed learning, lectures and presentations, or an abundance of books– although each may at one time or another be important resources.

C.H. Patterson, in an article on "The Preparation of Humanistic Teachers," highlights such characteristics as "empathetic understanding, respect or warmth, and genuineness. It is therefore apparent that teacher education must center upon the feelings, attitudes and beliefs of the teacher, including

attitudes toward himself, or the self-concept."

Muessig and Cogan, in an article "To Humanize Schools," describe some teachers as: "loving, sensitive, empathetic, accepting, imaginative, lively, colorful, humorous, thoughtful, generous, candid, charismatic."

Art Combs and his associates, proponents of humanistic teachers, conducted studies that indicated good teachers differ from poor teachers in their attitudes and beliefs. They found good teachers as compared to poor teachers perceived others as:

1. able rather than unable
2. friendly rather than unfriendly
3. worthy rather than unworthy
4. internally rather than externally motivated, or controlled
5. dependable rather than undependable
6. helpful rather than hindering

The studies also indicated that good teachers perceive themselves as more adequate, trustworthy, worthy, wanted and identified with others. Thus, their beliefs about themselves and their self-concepts are different from poor teachers.

The Other Side of the Coin

Each of you is prepared to contend that I have offered you nothing new. You may further contend that you reflect that center of humanism in your classroom. If you are the centers of humanism, you are to be commended. However, the majority of schools and universities throughout this nation prevents us from treating the topic of "Humanism and the Classroom Teacher" with benign neglect.

If we take a cue from Alton Harrison and the rest of the education critics, we have found that the conspicuous lack of humanism in classrooms has resulted in schools which appear to be ". . . repressive factories whose main purpose at the elementary level is custodial and at the upper level, utilitarian."

Erik Erikson sings the chorus of a similar song. He says, and I quote: "The most deadly of all possible sins is the mutilation of a child's spirit." Consequently, Charles Silberman, in his book *Crisis In The Classroom*, reports that it is not possible to spend any prolonged period visiting public school classrooms without being appalled by the mutilation visible everywhere--mutilation of spontaneity, of joy in learning, of pleasure in creating a sense of self. The public schools are 'killers of the dream'." Not only have some schools become killers of the dream, they have the concomitant of a spiral of failure for future generations.

History has many analogies that can bring into focus the concern for the Spiral of Failure blacks are sure to experience as a result of the loss of control over education for themselves.

I make reference to "Spiral" because it gives the connotation needed to dramatize the seriousness of our dilemma. As you may recall, a spiral is a curve which continuously recedes from a center or fixed point while continuing to revolve around it. As an infant and a child, the black kid's center of existence revolves around the limited and protected environment provided him by his parents. As he becomes older, his environment is expanded to include home, church, the school, and society at large. Each bombards him with changing customs and mores that are more likely to be alien to his existence.

The plight of Puerto Ricans provides us with a historical analogy that reflects their spiral of failure.

According to a "Summary of Perceived Needs of the Puerto Rican Community," presented to a United States Senate Committee on Equal Educational Opportunities in 1960, of all Puerto Ricans 25 years of age or older, 87 percent had dropped out without graduating from high school. The rate of dropouts for eighth grade was 52.9 percent. In 1968-69, the dropout rate for Puerto Rican students by the twelfth year of schooling was 80 percent compared with 46 percent for black students and 28.9 percent Anglos.

Presently, no more than 5 percent of Puerto Rican college-age youth are moving on to higher education, the rate for the blacks being 15 to 20 percent, and for the general population, 45 percent. According to a report from Aspira, an organization for Puerto Ricans which works with the educational

problems of Puerto Rican youths, the dropout rate for Puerto Ricans admitted to colleges is 60 percent.

In March, 1971, a report was presented to the New York State Board of Regents in which it stated that of the 1.1 million students, 25 percent (25,000) are Puerto Rican, only 3 percent (1600) of the students who received academic diplomas were Puerto Rican. In School District 7, 65 percent (20,000) of the students are Puerto Rican. However, there are only three principals and assistant principals of a total of 91 who are Puerto Rican. In this same District, of 1580 teachers, only 55 are Puerto Rican; of 32 guidance counselors, only one is Puerto Rican. The person who made the report asserts: "If one or two children are failing in a class, perhaps there is something wrong with those children, but when 73 percent of a district is failing, there has to be something wrong with the schools."

The situation for Chicano students is similar to that of Puerto Ricans. In the Southwest, the average Chicano child has only a 7th grade education.

College enrollment is infinitesimally small. In California where 14 percent of public school students are Chicanos, less than one-half percent of college students at the seven campuses of the University of California are Chicanos.

The litany of statistical facts can be extended to reflect the position of discomfort minorities find themselves in relation to equal educational opportunity. Hopefully, legal intervention will provide the leverage needed to enhance the cadre of humanistic teachers who are greatly needed if every citizen of the United States is to realize his full potential.

Probably no aspect of our individual lives is of greater importance than our relationships with other human beings. From the time life begins human relationships facilitate learning when they are good and block learning when they are bad or missing. Satisfaction or deprivation of satisfaction of the universal basic need to be liked and needed, to belong to and be wanted, no matter how different one may be, reverberates through one's life.

–Gertrude Noar

REFERENCES

Barton, Derry. *Reach Touch and Teach.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

DeWitt, Gerald. "How to Identify Humanistic Teachers," *NASSP Bulletin*, LXII, December, 1973, pp. 19-25.

Harrison, Alton R. "Humanism and Educational Reform–The Need for a Balanced Perspective," *Educational Forum*, XXXVIII, March, 1974, pp. 331-36.

Hogg, Thomas and Marlin R. McComb. "Cultural Pluralism: Its Implications for Education," *Challenges to Education.* Emanuel Hurwitz and Charles A. Tesconi. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1972.

Knowles, Louis L. and Kenneth Prewitt, eds. *Institutional Racism in America.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

LaCourse, Richard. "Indian Politics in Changing Times," *Race Relation Reporter*, Vol. IV, No. 12, June 25, 1973, pp. 5-8.

Landes, Ruth. *Culture in American Education.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Mohr, Paul. "Preparing Teachers for Multicultural Schools: A Team Effort." A presentation made at the Annual Regional Conference on Student Teaching, Jackson State College, January 27, 1973.

Muessig, Raymond H. and John J. Cogan. "To Humanize Schools," *Educational Leadership*, XXX, October, 1972, pp. 34-36.

Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in the Classroom.* New York: Random House, 1970.

Smith, B.O. *Teachers for the Real World.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, 1969.

Tesconi, Charles A. and Emanuel Hurwitz. *Education for Whom?* New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1974.